REMARKS

Claim 1 remains in the application and has been amended hereby.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 102, as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,631,100 ("Utsumi") or U.S. Patent No. 5,808,233 ("Kurakake et al.") or U.S. Patent No. 6,462,263 ("Matsumoto et al.").

It is respectfully submitted that none of the cited references teaches "managing partitioning information relating range information of program numbers and group names," as recited in amended claim 1.

The cited references, Utsumi, Kurakake et al., and Matsumoto et al. are merely teaching partitioning character strings and are silent about managing partitioning information relating range information of program numbers and group names. See Fig. 7 of Utsumi, Fig. 7A of Kurakake et al., and Fig. 3 of Matsumoto et al., for example.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Utsumi, or Kurakake et al., or Matsumoto et al.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Dockes et al. in view of Matsumoto et al.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Dockes et al. and Matsumoto et al. fails to show or suggest managing

partitioning information relating range information of program numbers and group names, as recited in amended claim 1.

The Office Action at paragraph 8 concedes that Dockes et al. fails to show or suggest any ability to partition the information appropriately and cites Matsumoto et al. as curing this deficiency.

It is respectfully submitted that Matsumoto et al. is merely teaching partitioning character strings and is silent about partitioning information relating range information of program numbers and group names. See Fig. 3 of Matsumoto et al., for example.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended claim 1 is patentably distinct over Dockes et al. in view of Matsumoto et al.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 1 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,580,679 in view of Matsumoto et al.

Applicants will submit a Terminal Disclaimer to overcome this rejection at a later time, if necessary. However, the amendments made to the claim hereby are thought to take the claimed invention out of the scope of the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,580,679 in view of Matsumoto et al.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been reviewed and is not seen to show or suggest the present invention

as recited in the amended claim.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted, COOPER & DUNHAM, LLP

Jay H. Maioli Reg. No. 27,213

JHM/PCF:pmc